DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 286 591 PS 016 734

AUTHOR Marshall, Hermine H.
TITLE Toward Motivation To Learn: Explorations of Classrooms with a Learning Orientation.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 87
GRANT NIE-G-80-0071
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Environment; Classroom Research; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Students; Elementary School Teachers; Expectation; *High Achievement; Interviews; *Learning Motivation; *Low Achievement; Teacher Attitudes; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Work Orientation

ABSTRACT

This paper maintains that learning for the purpose of understanding is central to classes that are oriented towards learning. Such classes, which can be said to have a "learning orientation," can be differentiated from classes where an emphasis on performance or doing work increases the likelihood of rote or short-term learning. Four elementary grade classes were selected for observations on the basis of teacher statements emphasizing thinking and the challenge of learning. Three of the classes showed clear evidence of learning orientation; the fourth showed evidence of a working orientation as well. A theme analysis of the class observations revealed that teachers in all four classes accepted individual differences; held positive expectations; and used encouragement and preventive management. Teachers in classes with a clear learning orientation also emphasized a learning purpose, peer helping, self-evaluation, supportiveness, and probing of errors. The work-oriented class exhibited concern for the work and the amount of time needed to do it, and for academic competition. Teacher displays of negative performance also played a significant role in these classes. (Author/PCB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

DRAFT

ED286591

TOWARD MOTIVATION TO LEARN: EXPLORATIONS OF CLASSROOMS WITH A LEARNING ORIENTATION

Hermine H. Marshall

San Francisco State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Hermine H. Marshall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington DC, April, 1987.

Appreciation is expressed to Mary Lou Bedrosian Vernon and Yu Wen Ying for help in data collection, to Barbara Hutcheson for help in coding, and to Cheri Araki for help in data analysis. Gratitude is also expressed to the teachers, students, and administrators for their cooperation and participation in this study.

The data were collected with a grant from the National Institute of Education (Grant G-80-0071). The opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of this agency and no official endorsement should be inferred.

PS 016734

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Four elementary grade classrooms, selected on the basis of teacher statements emphasizing thinking and the challenge of learning are explored. Analysis of recurrent themes indicates that 3 classrooms showed clear evidence of a learning orientation and 1 classroom showed evidence of a work orientation as well. Theme analysis revealed that acceptance of individual differences, positive expectations and encouragement, and preventive management were found in all 4 classrooms. Classrooms with a clear learning orientation also displayed a learning purpose, peer helping, self-evaluation, and supportiveness and probing of errors. Instead, the fourth classroom exhibited concern for work and time to do it in, display of negative performance, and academic competition. Analysis of lesson-framing and management statements documented more endogenous lesson-introductions and fewer negative management statements in the clear learning-oriented classrooms. Interviews with teachers in the clear learning-oriented classrooms indicated a belief that all students can learn and a concern for motivating them. Negative strategies may have undermined attempts to establish a learning orientation in the fourth classroom. Suggestions are made for selection criteria and for future research.

This paper explores teaching strategies and teacher beliefs in four classrooms which appear to have a "learning orientation." Learning for the purpose of understanding is central to learning-oriented classrooms. These classrooms can be differentiated from classrooms where an emphasis on performance or "doing work" is more likely to lead to rote or short-term learning.

At least two factors within the classroom affect the type of learning that occurs: (a) curriculm content and (b) type of teaching strategies used, especially motivational and supporting strategies. Curriculum content is critical to classroom tasks and what is learned. However, even a meaningful curriculum can be undermined by motivational strategies that reward completing work or short-term learning of superficial content rather than understanding and integration. The focus of this paper, therefore, is on teaching strategies in classrooms which appear to have an orientation toward learning and understanding. Teachers' beliefs underlying this orientation are also examined. Consideration of the particular content of the curriculum is beyond the scope of this paper.

Because learning is an internal process, determination of when learning has occurred must generally be demonstrated through some sort of observable performance. Although the purported goal of most classroom activities is learning, performance and work completion frequently receive greater emphasis. As a result, students often perceive that performing and completing work are the goals of assignments. Performance goals center on obtaining favorable evaluations and reinforcement for performance regardless of the learning involved. In contrast, learning goals entail attempting to master or understand new skills or concepts without regard for external reinforcement (cf. Ames & Ames, 1984; Brophy, 1983; Dweck, 1986).

Recently, interest in motivation and learning has turned from external sources of reinforcement (e.g., praise, grades) toward "motivation to learn." Within the classroom, motivation to learn refers to capitalizing on the meaningfulness, value, and benefits of learning and mastering the concepts and skills of the curriculum in order to engage students in these tasks (Brophy, 1983). The value and benefits of academic tasks are seen in terms of the learner's self-development. This approach can be contrasted with engaging in tasks for "exogenous" reasons, wherein tasks are perceived as means to some other end, such as rewards. Motivation to learn has much in common with intrinsic motivation (e.g., Deci, 1975) and "continuing motivation" (Maehr, 1976), since intrinsic/endogenous reasons for task engagement are primary in these types of motivation. Also related to this conception of motivation to learn are approaches to motivation that allow for choice without exogenous pressures, since choosing to engage in tasks for one's own reasons results in higher quality engagement and output (e.g., Kruglanski, 1978). Furthermore, continued motivation to engage in learning activities has been found to be enhanced by a degree of student responsibility for learning--under appropriate conditions (Thomas, 1980).

Little research is available concerning teacher strategies that specifically affect student motivation to learn. Brophy, Rohrkemper, Rashid, and Goldberger (1983) investigated the relationship between (a) teacher statements to present lessons and (b) student motivation as measured by the level of task engagement. Contrary to their hypotheses, student engagement was higher when teachers launched directly into the task than when teachers began

with "presentation" statements. However, the Brophy et al. study examined only a single type of teaching strategy--statements teachers use to present lessons--and ignored the larger configuration of other strategies within the classroom that may interact with, support, or undermine attitudes toward motivation and learning (Marshall & Weinstein, 1984).

The importance of considering the larger classroom context in research on classroom processes has recently been noted (Marshall & Weinstein, 1984). For example, a teacher may rarely use motivational statements to introduce lessons, but during work periods may motivate students to perform the task or complete work through rewards or threats of punishment. This may have been the case for the teachers in the Brophy et al. study. Another teacher may use strategies that focus on endogenous reasons for initially engaging in lessons as well as for maintaining student attention throughout the lesson. This teacher may also use other strategies that are mutually supportive of motivation to learn, such as providing for choice and encouraging student responsibility for learning. Still other teachers may use endogenous attributions to frame lessons--theoretically supporting motivation to learn--but subsequently use exogenous attributions to keep students on task--thereby diminishing the effect of the initial endogenous motivational strategies. In this case, management strategies may serve to hinder motivation to learn.

In contrast to focusing on the role of a single type of teacher behavior, a series of exploratory studies based on a secondary analysis of data collected for other purposes has examined a larger variety of strategies that may contribute to a more general learning orientation, as opposed to a work (performance) orientation. In classrooms with a learning orientation, teachers attempt to motivate their students to learn and understand and help them to see learning as beneficial to their own self-development through a variety of interacting strategies. This orientation may be similar to the task mastery orientation described by Ames & Ames (1984).

In the first two studies in this series, teacher strategies in three fifth grade classrooms selected on the basis of a theme analysis as representing different goal orientations (toward learning, toward work, or toward work-avoidance) were examined. One study demonstrated how three types of strategies, including those used to manage and maintain on-task behavior and handle responsibility for learning, as well as lesson-presentation statements, supported or undermined motivation and learning (Marshall, 1986; in press). A second study described how a more inclusive set of teacher strategies, including treatment of errors and statements concerning expectations and standards, contributed to building these orientations (Marshall, 1987).

These initial descriptions have begun to shed light on our understanding of the configuration of strategies involved in creating an orientation toward learning, at least in one fifth grade classroom (Classroom K). The current study extends this type of exploratory analysis to classrooms at other grade levels where learning themes have been observed in order to ascertain commonalities and variations among classrooms with a learning orientation. The basic questions being explored are (a) are the themes and strategies found in the learning-oriented fifth grade classroom found in classrooms at other grade levels and (b) in what ways do classrooms showing some evidence of a learning orientation vary?

Method

Subjects

Classrooms for this study were selected according to the following procedures. In an earlier study of classroom factors affecting the development of students' achievement expectations, students in 30 first-, third-, and fifth-grade classrooms in urban, multi-ethnic schools had rated the frequency with which their teacher exhibited selected behaviors toward high and low achievers (Marshall & Weinstein, 1986; Weinstein & Marshall, 1984). Within each grade, two classrooms in which students perceived teachers exhibiting greatest differential treatment and two where least differential treatment was perceived were selected for extensive classroom observation. (See Weinstein & Marshall, 1984 for a fuller description of the criteria for selection of the 12 classrooms.)

The transcripts of the observations in each of the 12 classrooms were subjected to a theme analysis (blind to the level of differential teacher treatment) (Marshall & Weinstein, in press; Spradley, 1980). Teacher statements reflecting information about learning and management strategies and those conveying messages about ability, expectations, and attributions were recorded (with page and line number). These statements were analyzed for recurrent themes within classrooms. A summary of themes that occurred in any of the classrooms was then made. The transcripts of each classroom were read a second time by the same researcher in search of evidence of any of the summary themes that had not originally been found in that classroom as well as disconfirming evidence of any of the themes. Corroboration and disconfirmation were also sought by checking the themes against observers' impressions and teacher interviews. The themes were unrelated to the selection criteria and classification of classrooms in the earlier study on extent of perceived differential teacher treatment.

Three different orientations toward learning and motivation emerged in this theme analysis. Three classrooms (one each at Grades 1, 3, and 5) displayed a clear learning orientation with some emphasis on motivation to learn. In five classrooms (three at Grade 1, one at Grade 3, and one at Grade 5), external reinforcement for work completion (performance) was evident, suggesting a work (perfomance) orientation. One classroom (at Grade 5) exhibited a lack of clear motivating strategies and avoidance of work. The orientations in the remaining three classrooms were less clear-cut. In two classrooms (at Grade 3), themes of external reinforcement for work completion as well as occasional learning orientation appeared. The individualized nature of learning and private communication (much inaudible to the observer) in the last classroom (Grade 5) precluded adequate classification.

The criteria for selecting classrooms for this study were teacher statements emphasizing thinking and the challenge of learning. These criteria resulted in selection of four classrooms. Three classrooms were those that displayed a clear learning orientation: Classrooms L (Grade 1), B (Grade 3), and K (Grade 5)--the classroom from the earlier study. One classroom showed evidence of both learning and work orientation: Classroom D (Grade 3). (Occasional evidence of a work orientation in Classroom B was not at all dominant.)

The teachers had a minimum of 5 years teaching experience. One teacher was male. Three teachers were white and one was Asian. Each class had about 30 students. Entering achievement (California Test of Basic Skills Reading Achievement--percentile for Grade 1 and grade equivalent scores for Grades 3 and 5) varied: Classroom L (Grade 1) = 84.04 percentile, Classroom D (Grade 3) = 2.59, Classroom B (Grade 3) = 3.39, Classroom K (Grade 5) = 5.99, although there appeared to be a ceiling for the students in Classroom B. As an indicator of socioeconomic level, the percentage of free lunch varied from 7% in the school where Classroom L was located to 64% in the school where Classroom D was located. The ethnic mix also varied in the four classrooms: from 24 white, 4 black, and 2 Hispanic in Classroom L to 0 white, 20 black, 6 Hispanic, and 4 other or unknown in Classroom D. The ethnic composition in Classrooms B and K was more equally balanced between white and black.

Measures

Classroom observation. Trained observers used the Classroom Dimensions Observation System (Marshall & Weinstein, 1982) to make narrative records of classroom events. With this system, the observer focuses on: (a) the structure of tasks, subject matter, and materials; (b) grouping practices; (c) locus of responsibility in learning; (d) feedback and evaluation; (e) motivation; (f) quality of teacher-student relationships; and (g) expectation statements.

Observers undertook extensive training for 11 weeks. To ascertain adequate inter-observer agreement of the narrative records, the transcripts of the field notes during training were inspected for correspondence of events between observers. Training continued until agreement was reached. The trainer continued to review incoming transcripts during data collection.

Teacher interviews. Teachers were interviewed to clarify the classroom observations. Open-ended interview questions centered on locus of responsibility for learning and evaluation (student or teacher), conceptualization of students' abilities, and effective teaching strategies for high and low achievers. Teachers had previously ranked the students in their class according to their expectations for year-end achievement. In the interview, they were asked in an open-ended manner to describe the student whom they had ranked highest and the student whom they had ranked lowest in expectations for year-end reading.

Procedures

Three trained observers observed in one classroom at a time over a period of 2 to 4 weeks. Preliminary observations were made to acclimate the observer and the students. After these initial observations, at least 12 additional hours of observations per classroom were made in an attempt to observe three periods during which high and low reading groups received instruction, three math lessons, and some whole-class discussion or organizational time. The content of the observations during the remainder of the time varied according to the type of activity common to the particular classroom.

Observers made a running record of events in the classroom, focusing on the teacher and the students with whom the teacher interacted. Teacher statements other than subject matter content were recorded as closely to verbatim as possible. The tone of each statement (humorous, warm,

enthusiastic, matter-of-fact, firm, irritated/sarcastic, angry) was also recorded. In addition, the observers made separate notes of impressions and interpretations of events. Field notes were typed immediately according to a format for ease of retrieval of teacher statements. After the observations in each classroom, the observer interviewed the teacher. Interviews were audiotaped and transcribed.

Data analyses

All statements from the transcripts of the observations in the four classrooms were recorded that teachers used to (a) frame lessons, (b) maintain or refocus students' attention on the task after the lesson began--including additional motivating statements--and (c) encourage or discourage student responsibility for learning. The transcripts were read a second time several months later to retrieve any statements that had been missed on the first reading.

Lesson-framing statements were put into categories based in part on those used by Brophy et al. (1983). New categories were added to reflect other statements from these classrooms. (Categories are listed in the appendix.) Each lesson was coded for the presence or absence of each of the lesson-framing categories. Because each category used was coded as present for a given lesson introduction, multiple codes occurred when a teacher used more than one type of motivational statement to frame the lesson. However, even if a teacher mentioned a category more than once during the lesson introduction, it was recorded only once (since each lesson was coded for the presence of the category regardless of the number of times it was mentioned). To code management/maintenance statements during the lessons, categories were derived from the data and similar procedures were used. Each management/maintenance statement was coded for the presence or absence of each of the categories.

Statements encouraging or discouraging student responsibility for learning occurred too infrequently for the establishment of coding categories. Instead, differences among the teachers' methods for handling responsibility are described qualitatively.

Lesson-framing and management/maintenance statements were coded independently by two trained coders. Inter-rater agreement averaged across classrooms was .82 for lesson-framing statements and .85 for management/maintenance statements. All disagreements were resolved by discussion.

For purposes of analyzing the lesson-framing statements, relevant categories were aggregated into two superordinate categories: endogenous and exogenous (see Table 2). Statements in the first superordinate category are those postulated as supporting student motivation to learn and have either an endogenous quality to them (such as personal relevance, fun) or model or support learning for the enhancement of the learner (such as positive expectations, teacher enthusiasm). Statements included in the second superordinate category of exogenous statements (such as demands, time reminder/limit, challenge/goal settting) are imposed from outside. Statements labeled exogenous include both positive (e.g., rewards) and negative (e.g., threats) factors.

To analyze the management/maintanence statements, relevant categories were aggregated into superordinate categories of positive or negative statements. (See Table 3.) With the exception of one instance of rewards, the positive statements are endogenous, such as student interest or purpose, or supportive of the learner, such as encouragement or time information given for purposes of student planning. Negative statements refer to exogenous reasons.

Two types of proportional variables were created. First, to ascertain the proportion of lessons for which each category of lesson-framing statements was used, the number of lesson-framing statements in each category was divided by the total number of lessons. Second, to determine the relative frequency with which each category of management/maintenance statements was used, the number of statements in each category was divided by the total number of management/maintenance statements. To test for equality of the proportion of statements across teachers, a series of pairwise contrasts (associated with the chi square test of homogeneity) was performed (Marascuilo & McSweeney, 1977) on those variables of interest which occurred with sufficient frequency for statistical analysis. All z values reported are significant at alpha = .05 unless otherwise noted.

Results

In seeking to explore commonalities and variations among learning-oriented classrooms, two questions were explored: (a) whether the characteristics of Classroom K, the fifth-grade learning-oriented classroom (as previously differentiated from the fifth-grade work-oriented and work-avoidance classrooms) are found in classrooms at other grade levels and (b) whether there are differences among classrooms, particularly between those classrooms with a clear learning orientation (Classrooms L, B, and K) and the classroom with evidence of both a learning and a work orientation (Classroom D). To explore these questions, the themes found in the four learning-oriented classrooms are first compared with the themes found in the remaing eight classrooms from the original sample. A comparison is then made among themes found in the learning-oriented classrooms themselves. Analyses of lesson-framing statements, management/maintenance statements, and statements concerning responsibility are presented next. Teachers' views of high and low achievers and strategies effective for these students based on the interviews are then described. Finally, some differences in student behavior are briefly noted.

Themes

The major themes found in the original 12 classrooms are listed in Table 1. The dominant themes in the four learning-oriented classrooms are starred. In addition to the statements concerning thinking and challenge (which were the criteria for selecting learning-oriented classrooms), three other themes were common to the four classrooms selected as showing evidence of a learning orientation: acceptance of individual differences (e.g., "For some, spelling is the hardest subject"), positive expectations and encouragement (e.g., "I think you can do it"), and preventive management (e.g., removing potentially distracting objects, timing transitions to increase efficiency).

These four classrooms varied, however, in statements reflecting other themes. In the three classrooms showing a clear learning orientation (Classrooms L, B, and K), four additional themes emerged: (a) the purpose of

school and the assignment as learning (e.g., "We do it [the assignment] for fun and to learn"); (b) peer helping; (c) self-evaluation (e.g., "See if you have any 5's backwards," "Read it over again and see if it makes sense"); and (d) supportiveness and probing of incorrect responses (e.g., "I'd rather you make a mistake so we can talk about it").

In addition, certain themes were found only in individual classrooms (except for Classroom L). Individualization of instruction was found in Classroom B but not in the other learning-oriented classrooms. Behavioral competition (as differentiated from academic competition), such as points for getting ready quickly for the next activity, was observed in Classroom K but not in the other classrooms. Three themes emerged in Classroom D that did not appear in the other learning-oriented classrooms: (a) concern for work and time to do it in, such as "Boys, we don't waste time in Room 1. We have so much work to do"; (b) display of negative performance, such as asking students to read aloud the number wrong on math tests; (c) academic competition, such as telling one reading group that another group is catching up with them.

Lesson-framing Statements

Comparison of lesson-framing statements indicates that there were no significant differences among these four teachers in the proportion of lessons introduced with no motivational statements nor in the proportion of lesson introductions in which these teachers used statements regarding thinking or regarding exogenous reasons for the lesson. (See Table 2.) Teacher K (the fifth-grade learning-oriented teacher from the earlier study) appears to introduce a greater proportion of lessons with humor or as fun than did the other teachers; however, the frequencies in this category were too low for statistical analysis.

Comparison of lesson-framing statements suggests some differences between Teacher D, the teacher who had demonstrated evidence of both a learning and a work orientation, and the teachers who showed clear evidence of a learning orientation. Teacher D introduced a lower proportion of lessons using endogenous reasons--such as mind, purpose, personal relevance (z = 2.14, 2.16, and 2.42 for contrasts between Teacher D and Teachers L, B, and K, respectively). Although she appeared to use a greater proportion of exogenous reasons in presenting lessons--such as demand, recognition, competition--than the other three teachers, this difference was not statistically significant. Teacher D also appeared to refer to task difficulty and effort in a higher proportion of lesson introductions than the other three teachers; however, the frequencies in these categories were too low for statistical analysis.

Inspection of the transcripts of the two third grade classrooms further illustrates some subtle differences between the attempts of these teachers to arouse student interest. For example, in a lesson on the cost of purchasing food, Teacher D announced "I'm gonna make up my own menu. You get to do that when you're a teacher" (rather than allowing children to make up their own menus). In contrast, Teacher B allowed math problems to evolve from students' interests and other areas of the curriculum. For example, a lesson on intersecting sets was derived from a writing lesson where students had selected a sport that they were interested in. On George Washington's birthday, Teacher B raised the question of how old George Washington would be today, helping the students solve a subtraction problem.

Management/maintenance Statements

Analysis of management/maintanence statements indicates that Teacher K used a higher proportion of positive management/maintenance strategies overall than Teachers L, D, and B ($\underline{z}$ = 5.71, 7.75, and 4.61, respectively). (See Table 3.) (Teacher B also used a greater proportion of positive management/maintenance strategies than did Teacher D [$\underline{z}$ = 2.60].) In addition, Teacher K evoked thinking and challenge in a greater proportion of management/maintainence statements than did Teachers L, D, and B ($\underline{z}$ = 6.52, 7.78, and 6.08, respectively). She also referred to information concerning planning use of time more often (proportionally), although these frequencies were too low to analyze statistically.

The differences between teachers in the proportional use of negative statements were all significant except those between Teacher K and Teacher L. Teacher D showed a greater proportion of redirection with a negative tone or threat than Teachers L, B, and K ($\underline{z}$ = 4.71, 2.36, 5.06, respectively). Teacher B used a greater proportion of redirection with a negative tone or threat than Teachers L and K ($\underline{z}$ = 2.04, 2.54, respectively).

Student Responsibility

The three teachers with the clear learning orientation (L, B, and K) encouraged students to take some responsibility for learning or for evaluating their own work. For example, Teacher L asked students to find their own errors. She also had them evaluate themselves for grades on their report cards. Teacher B had students proofread their own writing and look up the answers to the questions they raised. Teacher B also used a contract system where students had some choice in the amount of work they would complete by the due date. Teacher K encouraged students to be self-directing and to evaluate their own work. For example, she provided a self-evaluation form (to be discussed with her later) for their independent projects.

In contrast, inspection of the transcripts for Classroom D showed no evidence of encouraging students to take responsibility for learning or evaluation. This classroom seemed to be a teacher-centered classroom, with a warm and supportive teacher who retained control and responsibility.

Teacher Interviews

When asked about their views of low achievers and effective strategies for these students, three of the four teachers--those with a clear learning orientation (L, B, and K)--emphasized that everyone (both high and low achievers) can learn and that motivating students was important. Their descriptions emphasized somewhat different points, however. Teacher L stated that she did not distinguish between high and low achievers

> because all children can learn, at their own rate of speed and at their own ability. And so whatever they're pulling out of this unit or out of the teaching is best for them. So I don't pull one group and say, this is just for you, and pull another group and say, you can't do this, or this is just for you. We do everything for everybody. ... I just do everything I can to motivate the children. First of all, I don't do anything that I'm not excited about. [She gives an example about dinosaurs.] I bring in a lot

> of materials; and because I'm excited about it, the kids become excited about it.

Teacher B described many of the same strategies for both high and low achievers. He stated, for example, that he gives open-ended assignments, such as "how many inequalities can you write in 5 minutes. ... So everyone can be successful, in the sense that some of the kids wrote three, SA wrote 25 and they were all right." He elaborated on giving choices and "keeping it open-ended so they're not trapped." He believes both high and low achievers can work at their own rate, telling students, "When you finish your assignment, you can go on. Don't wait for me." Teacher B also stated that he takes all students seriously. He honors "the fact that [low achievers] like school and want to do well." He gives them extra practice and "strict limits of minimum expectations. ... Not letting them slide. Not giving up on them. ... Evaluate them often."

Teacher K, too, described her belief in the ability of all students to learn:

> I find that I have to be much more directive [with low achievers]. ... And what I would like, hope to do, would be to get them motivated enough that they want to. And I don't know why it is that way because so many of the kids really have the ability and they're just putting a lampshade over it, you know; and I think those are the kids that I get the most angry, the most frustrated, the ones I really sit on the most. ... Because I know it's there and they'll do it sometimes, but, see, not consistent enough that they're finding the joy because they have enough skills.

In contrast to the emphasis of these three teachers on the ability of low achievers to learn and their strategies for motivating them, Teacher D responded to the question concerning low achievers in terms of home background and cooperativeness of parents as well as individual characteristics of students, such as "chronic complainer" or learning disability. She referred solely to eliciting parent help with extra homework as an effective strategy for low achievers. (Teachers B and L also mentioned parent contact as one of a number of useful strategies.)

Concerning effective strategies for high achievers, Teachers L, B, and K described opportunities and encouragement to go beyond particular assigned tasks. For example, Teacher L spoke of students making books, rather than just writing a story; Teacher B referred to open-ended assignments without limits; and Teacher K reported students using skills in their own way, being creative and needing freedom with some direction. Teachers B and K also mentioned choice and responsibility.

In contrast, Teacher D cited external reinforcers as an effective strategy for high achievers. She noted that highs just love to work and that they really enjoy stickers, applause, privileges, and having parents sign papers with 100% on them. She did not mention the opportunities for choice, responsibility, and creativity noted by the other teachers.

Student Behavior

The original data collection was not designed to focus on student behavior other than that in interaction with the teacher. However, on a number of occasions, student behavior was recorded in interaction with the teacher that reveals further differences between Classroom D and the other classrooms. Attempts at cheating were observed in Classroom D. Teacher D took a paper with multiplication tables away from one student and erased some multiplication tables from the desk of another student during timed math tests. Twice students were told not to look at another's paper. This type of behavior was not observed in the other classrooms, although timed math tests were also administered in the other third grade classroom.

One student in Classroom D cried after reporting aloud her score on the math timed test. This type of behavior was not observed in the other classrooms, nor was the oral reporting of scores.

Discussion

Although this exploratory study is based on a small sample selected originally for other purposes, the results suggest similarities and differences among learning-oriented classrooms which need to be pursued in future research. Certain commonalities emerged across the four classrooms selected on the basis of statements emphasizing thinking and the challenge of learning: All four classrooms revealed themes of acceptance of individual differences, positive expectations and encouragement, and preventive management.

Differences emerged between classrooms, however. Classroom K, the fifth grade learning-oriented classroom in the earlier study, seemed to demonstrate somewhat more evidence of a learning orientation. For example, Teacher K referred to thinking in a greater proportion of her management/maintenance strategies.

Some differences between classrooms were apparent that may be attributed to individual styles and classroom structures. For example, Teacher B's classroom was more individualized than the other classrooms. Teacher K more frequently introduced her lessons with humor or as fun.

Other differences were observed between the classrooms which had a clear learning orientation (Classrooms L, B, and K) and the classroom where evidence of a work orientation was also apparent (Classroom D). Classrooms L, B, and K showed themes of a learning purpose, peer helping, self-evaluation, and supportiveness for errors; whereas Classroom D did not. Instead, themes of work completion, display of negative performance, and academic competition emerged in Classroom D. Teacher D also used a lower proportion of endogenous statements to introduce lessons and a greater proportion of negative (exogenous) statements in managing lessons than did the other three teachers. In addition, Teachers L, B, and K seemed to believe that all students can learn. They described their efforts to motivate students, particularly low achievers. In contrast, Teacher D seemed to focus more on home and pupil characteristics as responsible for low achievers' work.

The themes and exogenous strategies found in Classroom D but not in the other classrooms--such as negative management statements, greater pressure to

complete work constrained by time limits, and display of negative behavior--may have undermined attempts at establishing a learning orientation in this classroom. The student cheating and distress at test scores found only in Classroom D are not outcomes that would be anticipated in learning-oriented classrooms.

These differences between Classroom D and Classrooms L, B, and K suggest that Classroom D may be a "false positive." The criteria for selection may have been inadequate. Emphasis on thinking and challenge may be a necessary but not sufficient criterion. One or more of the four additional themes common to Classrooms L, B, and K (the learning purpose of assignments, peer helping, self-evaluation, and supportiveness for errors) may also be critical in establishing a learning orientation. In addition, because certain exogenous strategies that Teacher D used (similar to those used by the teacher with a work orientation [Marshall, in press]) may have undercut the learning orientation, negative criteria might be considered for selection as well.

Further, the teacher interviews demonstrated that Teacher D's views of high and low achievers and of effective strategies for these students differed from those of Teachers L, B, and K. The belief that all students can learn may be critical to the implementation of a learning orientation (cf. Marshall, in press; Marshall & Weinstein, 1984). A survey of teachers' beliefs about student ability may be useful in selecting classrooms for future research on learning-oriented classrooms.

Classroom D is different from the other classrooms in a number of ways beyond strategies and teacher beliefs that may have influenced the differences in findings. The student population is from a lower socioeconomic level, and the students' entering achievement is lower than that of the other third grade as well as relatively lower than the other classrooms.

The differences between Classroom D compared with Classrooms L, B, and K raise some questions which cannot be answered by this small sample. First, some researchers (e.g., Bowles, 1977; Bowles & Gintes, 1976) have suggested that schools socialize students according to appropriate social class values and behaviors such that working-class schools emphasize behavioral control and rule-following; whereas higher socioeconomic schools encourage more independence, internalized controls, and a more open atmosphere. Whether the socioeconomic and achievement level of the students influences the orientation toward learning warrants further investigation.

Second, although an earlier study suggested differences in student behavior in classes with an orientation toward learning, work, and work-avoidance, further research is necessary to ascertain whether classrooms with a learning orientation do indeed foster greater on-task behavior, greater motivation and persistence, and more positive attitudes toward learning.

Moreover, much research in classrooms has been conducted with an analogy to "work settings" to the neglect of features that may be unique to "learning settings." This study suggests that expanding our research net to capture classrooms with a learning orientation may increase our awareness of the variety of factors beyond lesson introductions (Brophy et al., 1983) that may contribute to student motivation and learning, such as the emphasis on a learning purpose, encouragement of student responsibility, and teachers beliefs that all students can learn.

References

Ames, C., & Ames, R. (1984). Systems of student and teacher motivation: Toward a qualitative definition. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 535-556.

Bowles, S. (1977). Unequal education and the reproduction of the social division of labor. In J. Karabel & A. H. Halsey (Eds.), Power and ideology in education (pp. 137-152). New York: Oxford University Press.

Bowles, S., & Gintes, H. (1976). Schooling in capitalist America. New York: Basic Books.

Brophy, J. (1983). Conceptualizing student motivation. Educational Psychologist, 18, 200-215.

Brophy, J., Rohrkemper, M., Rashid, H., & Goldberger, M. (1983). Relationships between teachers' presentations of classroom tasks and students' engagement in those tasks. Journal of Educational Psychology, 75, 544-552.

Deci, E. L. (1975). Intrinsic motivation. New York: Plenum.

Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. American Psychologist, 41, 1040-1048.

Kruglanski, A. W. (1978). Endogenous attribution and intrinsic motivation. In M. R. Lepper & D. Greene, (Eds.), The hidden costs of reward (pp.85-108). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Maehr, M. L. (1976). Continuing motivation: An analysis of a seldom considered educational outcome. Review of Educational Research, 46, 443-462.

Marascuilo, L. A., & McSweeney, M. (1977). Nonparametric and distribution-free methods for the social sciences. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Marshall, H. H. (1986). Games teachers and students play: An analysis of motivation in three fifth grade classrooms. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Meeting, San Francisco.

Marshall, H. H. (1987). Building a learning orientation. Theory into Practice, 26, 8-14.

Marshall, H. H. (In press). Motivational strategies of three fifth- grade teachers. Elementary School Journal.

Marshall, H. H., & Weinstein, R. S. (1982). Classroom dimensions observation system: Manual. Berkeley, CA: Psychology Department, University of California.

Marshall, H. H. & Weinstein, R. S. (1984). Classroom factors affecting students' self-evaluations: An interactional model. Review of Educational Research, 54, 301-325.

Marshall, H. H., & Weinstein, R. S. (1986). Classroom context of student-perceived differential teacher treatment. Journal of Educational Psychology, 78, 441-453.

Marshall, H. H., & Weinstein, R. S. (In press). Beyond quantitative analysis: Recontextualization of classroom factors contributing to the communication of teacher expectations. In J. Green, J. Harker, & C. Wallet (Eds.) Multiple analysis of classroom discourse processes, Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp.

Spradley, J. (1980). Participant observation. New York: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston.

Thomas, J. W. (1980). Agency and achievement: Self-managment and self-regard. Review of Educational Research, 50, 213-240.

Weinstein, R. S., & Marshall, H. H. (1984). Ecology of students' achievement expectations: Final report. Berkeley, CA: Psychology Department, University of California.

Table 1

Recurrent Themes

Theme Categories and Themes	Classrooms: Grade 1 L	J	H	F	Grade 3 D	B	A	C	Grade 5 E	G	I	K
Orientation												
*Challenge, thinking,	x				x	x						x
▫ Purpose = learning	x					x						x
Fun						x						x
*Encouragement, pos. expectations	x				x	x			x			x
Individualized				x		x			x			
Progress	x				x							
Work		x			x	o	x	x			x	
Avoidance										x		
Management												
*Preventive	x				x	x		x	x			x
Display positive	x	x	x	x	x	x			o	x		
Display negative		x	x	x	x		x			o	x	
Threats			x				x	o			x	
Rewards, points		x		x				x				x
Cooperation/Competition												
Cooperative	x			x					x			x
Behavior competition		x						o				x
Academic competition		x	x		x		x					
▫ Sts help sts	x	x		x		x			x			x
Feedback & Evaluation												
▫ Self-evaluation	x					x			x			x
▫ Support/Probe	x			x		x		x				x
Basis for learning	x				o							x
Blame students							x				x	
Individual Differences												
*Acceptance	x				x	x	o	x				x
Labelling[a]			-	+	+	+	+-	+	+		-	
Responsibility, Trust												
Student responsibility						x		x	x			x
Lack of trust			x				x				x	

Notes: Classrooms selected as learning-oriented are underlined.
* = Theme common to classrooms selected as learning-oriented.
▫ = Theme common to classrooms with clear learning orientation.
o = Occasional.

[a] + = positive; - = negative

Table 2

Number and Percent of Lesson Framing Statements

	Teacher L		Teacher D		Teacher B		Teacher K	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Lessons	40		63		49		31	
Statements	61		96		80		51	
None	15	38	30	48	18	37	10	32
Think/Mind	7	18	9	14	9	18	9	29
Fun/Game/Humor	3	8	2	3	4	8	7	23
Personal Relevance	2	5	4	6	8	16	6	19
T Enthusiasm	3	8	1	2	1	2	2	7
Pos. Expectations	7	18	7	11	1	2	3	10
Choice	2	5	1	2	11	22	0	0
Purpose	3	8	1	2	1	2	1	3
Value St. Opinion	1	3	1	2	4	8	2	7
Background/Context	0	0	0	0	5	10	0	0
Task Difficulty	1	3	6	10	1	2	1	3
Task Ease	1	3	3	5	1	2	0	0
Effort	2	5	6	10	2	4	1	3
Continuity	8	20	9	14	3	6	3	10
Demand	2	5	8	13	5	10	0	0
Accountability	1	3	3	5	3	6	2	7
Other	2		4		4		2	
Total Endogen.[a]	20	50	18	29	24	49	17	55
Total Exogen.[b]	5	12	15	24	6	12	3	10

Note. Percent of types of lesson framing statements to total lessons. Percentages do not total 100, since more than one type of statement could be used in each lesson and only categories used 3 or more times by at least one teacher are listed.

[a]Think, Fun, Choice, Purpose, Personal Relevance, Teacher Personalizes, Teacher Enthusiasm, Positive Expectations, Values Student Opinion.

[b]Accountability, Demand, Threat, Rewards, Time Reminder, Challenge/Goal Setting.

Table 3

Number and Percent of Management/Maintenance Statements

	Teacher L		Teacher D		Teacher B		Teacher K	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Lessons	40		63		49		31	
Manage/Mainten. Statements	101		260		108		81	
Attend/Focus	2	2	24	9	1	1	10	12
Redirect Alone	10	10	28	11	12	11	2	3
Redirect w/Cause	40	40	78	30	39	36	13	16
Think/Challenge	6	6	14	5	9	8	29	36
Tease/humor	1	1	2	1	2	2	3	4
Pos. Exp/Encour.	5	5	11	4	4	4	5	6
Student Interest	0	0	1	.4	4	4	1	1
Time Info/Plan	3	3	2	1	3	3	9	11
Task Difficulty	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	0
Hurries	7	7	6	2	4	4	0	0
Effort	3	3	5	2	1	1	0	0
Example	14	14	2	1	0	0	0	0
Teacher Feelings	1	1	7	3	4	4	3	4
Accountability	0	0	7	3	2	2	0	0
Redirect Neg.	2	2	64	25	13	12	0	0
Threat/Punish	4	4	6	2	5	5	2	3
Other	1	1	0	0	5	5	4	5
Total Refocusing	93	92	222	85	98	91	42	52
Total Positive[a]	18	18	33	13	27	25	43	53
Total Negative[b]	6	6	70	27	18	17	2	3

Note. Percent of types of statements to total number of management/maintenance statements. Only categories used 3 or more times by at least one teacher are listed.

[a]Challenge/Think, Humor, Teacher Enthusiasm, Teacher Models, Purpose, Help, Time Information/Plan, Positive Expectations/Encouragement, Rewards, Student Interest, Task Difficulty.

[b]Redirect Negative and Threat.